beyond services and beyond jobs:

people's need to grow

a report by the
national council of welfare

september 1974

national council
of welfare

conseil national
du bien-être social

BEYOND SERVICES AND BEYOND JOBS:

PEOPLE'S NEED TO GROW

A report by the National Council of Welfare

National Council of Welfare
Brooke Claxton Building
Ottawa K1A 0K9

September 1974

In April 1973 the Government of Canada published its Working Paper on Social Security in Canada. With this document it initiated a process of federal-provincial consultation and invited national discussion of the re-shaping of social security programs in Canada.

The federal-provincial consultations have evidently been extensive - more than 30 meetings of working parties, seven meetings of deputy ministers and three meetings at the ministerial level in just the first year of the two-year review process. The national discussion has been considerably less extensive - fewer than a dozen organizations have prepared submissions responding to the propositions presented in the Working Paper. This handful of groups covers a spectrum which includes such diverse bodies as the United Church, the Chamber of Commerce and the Canadian Council on Social Development.

The National Council of Welfare's commentary on the Working Paper, entitled Incomes and Opportunities, was published in November 1973. In that document we responded in general terms to the propositions set out in the Working Paper and indicated our intention of responding more specifically to program proposals as they were developed by the federal-provincial review. In this report we are looking at one area in which the Ministers have indicated that program proposals will soon be forthcoming, the area of community employment.

This report, like our earlier commentary on the Working Paper, is presented in the belief that those who design social programs do so in a vacuum only if those who have an interest in those programs permit a vacuum to exist. It seems to us

particularly important that those organizations and agencies
which are confronted daily with the consequences of the
present inadequate system of social security in Canada make
known the conclusions which they draw from that experience.
This includes not only social agencies, social planning
councils, service organizations and other bodies directly
involved in the social service field but those indirectly
involved as well - churches, unions, co-ops, and others.

We are disappointed that so few such organizations
have thus far seen fit to respond to the government's initial
working document. There are a vast number of agencies,
organizations and institutions in this country whose concern
for social issues has been manifested time and again over
the years. We hope that these bodies will come forward in
the months ahead, making their views on the issues of the
present social security review known to government and to
the Canadian people. We think it is essential that these
voices of concern be heard if the results of the review are
to adequately meet those concerns.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

It was not so long ago that in each of Canada's provinces there was a "welfare department". That was before the wave of criticism of the programs and practices of these departments as 'authoritarian, paternalistic and debilitating of the self-respect of recipients'. Today not one Canadian province boasts a department of welfare. Instead they have departments of Social Development, Human Resources, Community Services, Social Affairs and the like.

Beyond the changes of name there have been some more substantial changes. Many of the most criticized practices - particularly in the social assistance field - have been ended, and a variety of efforts to minimize acknowledged program shortcomings have been instituted. In addition, the new/old departments have proclaimed their commitment to human development goals reflective of their new names. But that, unfortunately, appears to be the forward line of progress to date. With few exceptions, the enlightened new names and visionary new goals have not been accompanied by the dramatically new programs that might have given substance to the trumpeted new beginnings.

In their proclaimed goals these departments have moved from a need-meeting function that saw human needs in exceedingly narrow terms to one which is more reflective of the reality of human existence. It has now been recognized - nominally at least - that beyond the obvious physical needs of food and warmth and shelter are a range of psychological and social needs that are less tangible but no less real. It is these that have long been ignored in relation to the disadvantaged sectors of Canada's population.

People need a sense of identity and of personal worth.
They need to believe in their own capacities, and they need
the chance to test those capacities - to develop and grow
and seek to fulfil the potential they see in themselves.
The failure to recognize and provide for these needs results
in social consequences as real as those which flow from a
failure to meet physical needs. The price of human develop-
ment stifled is counted out in mental illnesses and rising
rates of alcoholism and drug abuse, incidences of delinquency
and of violent crime. It is paid for in broken homes and
twisted lives, and its monuments are our prisons and our
psychiatric hospitals.

In its various reports the National Council of Welfare
has asserted the right of every member of the Canadian
society to a share in the national wealth sufficient to
enable him or her to participate fully in that society. It
has argued the urgent and imperative need of a social security
system that will ensure such an adequate income to all
Canadians; but it has also noted that such an income distri-
bution program cannot alone guarantee that the opportunity
of full participation becomes a reality for every Canadian.

Lack of income virtually assures an incapacity to
participate in the social opportunity situations that enable
individuals to expand and grow and develop their potentials
as people. But it is not the only such bar to participation.
Some who are not poor find themselves on the margins of
society's opportunity structures for different reasons. The
fact of race, language, ethnicity, sex, age or any of a
number of factors may be responsible for this state of margin-
ality in relation to a particular set of social circumstances.

This report is about human needs and about the creation of social opportunity situations that enable people to develop and grow. A truly comprehensive discussion of social opportunities - of every door in life that is either open or closed - would involve the totality of human existence, considerably more than any report could pretend to encompass. In the present discussion we will seek only to indicate some of the ways in which opportunities for self-maximization are being denied to many members of our society, and how some of those missing opportunities can be returned to them.

In any such discussion questions of social services and of employment loom large because these have been seen, respectively, as the means of meeting social needs and of providing social opportunities. In fact, however, while both are very relevant, neither offers more than a very partial solution and, in certain cases, each may contribute as much to reinforcing the problem as to solving it.

Also very relevant - or potentially so - is the community employment program that the federal and provincial governments have talked of launching shortly "to provide socially useful employment" and "as a means of meeting social needs that are now neglected or inadequately met". The proposal to establish such a community employment program was contained in the federal government's Working Paper on Social Security more than a year ago. Federal-provincial consultations began shortly thereafter, and the launching of this program is expected within the next few months.

If the definition of social needs and the concept of individual social opportunity that is being employed by the federal and provincial policy makers who are now designing

this program is as broad as the professed goals of their new/old departments, then much of what we have to say in this paper may be redundant. We suspect, however, that this is not the case. It is an unfortunate but long-standing fact that when government policy makers (even nominally re-cycled ones) set out to define the needs of the disadvantaged, the results have indicated a very limited and narrow view of what life is - or should be - about, while their notions of opportunity creation have too often led only from one dead-end situation to another.

Meeting social needs and opening developmental doors is what the community employment program can do - if that is what it is designed to do. In this report we will discuss some of the ways in which the community employment program can link its employment creation and community service roles with a community development function in order to create new opportunities for individual social growth - for those who are employed in the projects it supports and for those they are designed to serve.

Creating opportunities for individual social growth must be the ultimate objective of the community employment program. Jobs, services and community development are essential means and, unquestionably, represent values of importance in themselves; but the ultimate objective must go beyond these. The end result of the new jobs, the new services and the enhanced sense of community must be to extend the horizons of growth-potential for the individual members of Canada's disadvantaged communities.

WORK AND NON-WORK ACTIVITIES

For some people the need to earn their own respect and
to strive for the fulfilment of what they perceive as their
potentials is substantially met in their work. They may not
achieve in it all that they wish to achieve, but it affords
them the opportunity to stretch for the limits of their
capacities. For most people, however, work alone does not
provide a sufficient vehicle to satisfy all such needs. For
some it may provide no such opportunity at all. The recent
report of the U.S. Government's Commission on Work in America
states:

> ... we find the "blues" of blue-collar workers
> linked to their job dissatisfactions, as is the
> disgruntlement of white-collar workers and the
> growing discontent among managers. Many workers
> at all occupational levels feel locked-in, their
> mobility blocked, challenge missing from their
> tasks.

Apart from the wages it provides, a job may offer the
opportunity for self-discovery and growth. But it may also
be a destructive, stultifying experience, crushing the
personality rather than enabling it to blossom, the source
of social problems rather than the antidote. The report on
Work in America concludes:

> Because work is central to the lives of so many
> Americans, either the absence of work or employ-
> ment in meaningless work is creating an
> increasingly intolerable situation. The human

costs of this state of affairs are manifested
in worker alienation, alcoholism, drug addic-
tion, and other symptoms of poor mental health.
Moreover, much of our tax money is expended in
an effort to compensate for problems with at
least a part of their genesis in the world of
work. A great part of the staggering national
bill in the areas of crime and delinquency,
mental and physical health, manpower and welfare
are generated in our national policies and
attitudes toward work.

The social problems cited by this report have long been
associated with the lack of income which characterizes poverty.
It is this that had led us, again and again, in report after
report, to argue that the foundation of Canadian social policy
must be the guarantee of an adequate income to all Canadians.
A guaranteed annual income will not alone solve all social
problems, but without it we cannot even make a beginning at
solving these problems. The link between inadequate income
and increased rates of personal dysfunction have been many
times illustrated.

Several years ago, for example, the social-mental health
study conducted by the Urban Social Redevelopment Project in
an area of Montreal's inner-city found that among those with
income of less than $100 per month, only 23% were in good
physical health while 47% were in poor physical health. This
compared with 90% in good physical health and only 5% in poor
physical health among those earning more than $500 per month.
The measurement of mental health in the area found the same
strong correlation between income and well-being.

A twenty-two item index of psychiatric symptoms indicating
impairment was employed to measure the mental health of area

residents: the greater the degree of impairment, the higher
the measurement recorded by the index. Among those earning
more than $500 a month the mean score recorded by the index
was 1.1; for those earning between $300 and $400 a month it
was 2.7; with monthly incomes between $150 and $200 it was
4.4; and among those with incomes of less than $150 per
month the index recorded a mean score of 6.2.

Incidence of social problems among children in the
area was also measured in relation to family income, using
an index based on twelve types of behavior problems. Again,
the higher the incidence of social problems found, the higher
the index measurement. And again a direct correlation with
income levels resulted. Among children in families with
income of more than $400 a month the mean score was .8; for
families with $200 to $300 monthly income it was 1.8; in
families where the monthly income was less than $200 it
was 2.1.

This causal relationship between social problems and
inadequate income is neither direct nor without exception.
The potential for mental illness, for alcoholism, for drug
dependency or whatever is distributed fairly evenly among
social classes. But the extent to which that potential is
manifested depends upon the stresses to which a person is
subjected. The manifold burdens of coping with poverty will
not generate mental illness in all who are poor; but they
will in many who would have been able to withstand the con-
siderably lesser tensions of a more secure existence.

To date there have been no studies carried out in this
country examining the relationship between socio-economic

status and alcohol-related problems, but a number of such
surveys have been carried out in the United States. A
recent review of the results of these studies concluded
that:

> Survey results indicate that percentages of
> drinkers increase with increasing social
> status. On the other hand, rates of heavy
> drinking, heavy-escape drinking, and problem
> drinking among drinkers are highest in lower
> status groups ... In brief, problem drinking
> and alcoholism are found to be strongly
> associated with lower socio-economic status. [1]

The report on Work in America, that problems of
alcoholism and physical and mental ill health are now being
increasingly found among those who lack neither income nor
employment, underlines what we have also many times asserted -
that incomes alone are only the beginning of an adequate
social policy and that jobs alone may be nothing more than
an inefficient conduit (inefficient in both social and
economic terms) for distributing income. People need the
challenge of growth-potential experiences in their lives; if
they do not find these in their work, they will seek them
elsewhere. And this leads to a very important difference
between the situations of those who suffer disadvantage in
all the traditional senses and the non-poor who have newly
discovered this emptiness in the seeming fullness of their
lives: The latter group can use their financial capacities
to seek what they have discovered their lives to lack.

----

[1]
   Roebuck and Kessler, The Etiology of Alcoholism (1972)
   at p. 201-2.

Paralleling the widely-reported decline in work-time satisfaction has been an equally widely-reported growth in an enormous range of non-work "leisure-time" activities. From the boom in do-it-yourself work in the home to the proliferation of classes in arts and handicrafts, from burgeoning enrollments in evening courses at universities to the burgeoning enrollments in fitness and sports programs, from participation in ratepayer groups to participation in encounter groups, people have been seeking and finding activities which, evidently, offer them something that enhances their lives.

What needs of an assembly-line worker are met by building his own recreation room? What needs of a salesman are met on a squash court? What needs of a suburban house-wife are met in a pottery class or a Greek history course? And what needs of a sole-support mother, an unemployed laborer, an Indian alone in the strangeness of a big city, are not being met through such outlets being effectively closed to them and there being no means available through which they can develop counterpart outlets to meet their particular needs?

There is a highly erroneous and simplistic - but nonetheless widespread - view in our society that "leisure-time" activity is a reward that must be earned rather than the manifestation of a human need. The word "leisure" has developed so many value-laden connotations as to be more misleading than descriptive. A better description of the kinds of activities we have been citing would simply be "non-work activity". Such activity exists because it reflects needs, and is engaged in because it satisfies needs. The social consequences of poverty and inequality - increased

incidences of physical and mental ill health, family breakdown,
delinquency and crime, to cite but a few - are the conse-
quences of our refusal to meet the range of needs that the
disadvantaged share in common with all other members of our
post-industrial society.

A separated or deserted mother with several young and
dependent children, for example, has a variety of needs.
She will likely require a source of income, which means
either social assistance or child care, perhaps occupational
re-training, and a job. She may have need of some forms of
remedial or educational services to help her adjust to her
new role and to enable her to help her children adjust to
their new situation. And she will have need of situations
in which her sense of self, which may have been badly
buffetted by the experience, can be reaffirmed. Once her
most immediate need of ensuring that she and her children
are not without food and shelter has been met, the
opportunity for participation in a peer-group setting in
which she can both establish relationships with others in
similar situations and engage in activities that interest
and challenge her may represent the most important need-
meeting vehicle that can be made available to her.

Similarly, a native person, newly arrived in the
disorienting strangeness of a big city may have urgent
need of a job. He may also need a variety of educational-
type social services to help him understand his new
environment. But, again, these are unlikely to be his only
needs. It is highly probable that, beyond services and
employment, what he very much needs is the company of other
native people - people whose identity he shares, with whom

he can exchange experiences and express freely his problems, hopes and concerns. A peer-group forum which enables him to engage socially with those who are in the process of making the same transition in lifestyle - and those who have already made it - may prove the key to the success or failure of his adjustment to his new circumstances.

The non-work activities that have proliferated in recent years in response to the needs of the middle class, in form and content reflect the needs of that sector of our society. The registration fee may totally bar the welfare mother from joining the suburban housewife in her Greek history or pottery classes, but it is likely not the only bar. Even if the fee were waived, most welfare mothers would probably feel a range of psychological deterrents to joining such a group. But even more to the point, pottery and/or Greek history may not at all represent the areas of interest of the low-income sole-support mother.

Traditional market mechanisms have created the present range of non-work activities, as those with the financial capacity to participate have voted with their registration fees and their membership dues for the activities that reflected their interests. Counterpart mechanisms, not based on disposition of surplus income, will be necessary if those who have no surplus income are to be enabled to create the counterpart outlets that reflect their needs.

Such mechanisms and such outlets are readily possible. What is required is a recognition by policy makers of the new/old departments (who in some provinces have not yet conceded that a telephone is not a needless luxury for

social assistance recipients) that these represent real social needs, and that to meet these needs is to invest in the prevention of a multitude of social problems by freeing the social growth potential of those trapped at the margins of our society.

SOCIAL NEEDS AND SOCIAL SERVICES

The role of social services and how their delivery
should be organized in order to best fulfil that role has
been the subject of extensive and critical scrutiny in
recent years on both sides of the Atlantic. The report of
the Castonguay-Nepveu Commission in the Province of Quebec
and the Seebohm Committee report in England have been land-
marks on their respective sides of the ocean. And in spite
of the very different histories of the social services in
Quebec and in England, the similarities between the findings
of these two reports is striking. The perspective which
they shared is well expressed in the following passage from
the British report:

> We see our proposals not simply in terms of
> organisation but as embodying a wider con-
> ception of social service, directed to the
> well-being of the whole of the community and
> not only of social casualties ... (This is)
> based on the practical grounds that the
> community is both the provider as well as the
> recipient of social services and that
> orientation to the community is vital if the
> services are to be directed to individuals,
> families and groups within the context of
> their social relations with others.

This view of social services as an integral component
in community life has been winning increasing adherence in
all parts of Canada. But, as with health services, the
wrenching of social services out of hardened, traditional
molds has proven a difficult process. The efforts to reorient

service objectives in very basic ways in these two allied
fields have closely paralleled one another. The prevailing
notion of health services in North America has been charac-
terized as "a pill for every ill"; only recently has this
remedial response attitude been seriously challenged by
preventive health care approaches and, more recently, by the
broader developmental approaches to community health espoused
by environmentalists and others. This same triumvirate of
approaches and chronology of their impacts can be seen in the
social services field.

The most common forms of social services are remedial
services. They deal with needs of a particularly acute kind -
the kind that are very often manifestations of an earlier
failure to deal with less acute problems. These services tend
to be patterned on the agency-centered, medical model and
include many services for the aged, the disabled and the
physically handicapped. Many services for the emotionally,
or socially disabled and handicapped are also offered in this
agency-centered, medical model, remedial form. An alcoholism
treatment center is one such example.

Contrasted with remedial services are preventive services
embodying the educational approach. In one form or another the
essence of these services is advice-giving, whether by way of
casework or groupwork with individual clients or by way of
community outreach programs. Like remedial services, these
programs too have their limitations - particularly when the
problem they are directed at is only the visible tip of an
iceberg of interrelated problems. Warning about the dangers of
alcoholism, for example, can do little when the drinking problem
reflects a family breakdown which, in turn, has resulted from the
material and emotional problems caused by extended unemployment.

It is an obvious fact that people - all people - have strengths and weaknesses. Remedial services are directed exclusively at dealing with weaknesses, either physical weaknesses or psycho-social weaknesses. Educational services are also oriented primarily to weaknesses, but to the avoidance of the effects of weaknesses rather than the subsequent treatment of these effects. Nonetheless, it is the weaknesses of the individual to which the service is directed, not his or her strengths.

The third approach to the delivery of social services, the developmental approach, combines elements of both the remedial and educational approaches, but through a strategy of developing strengths rather than addressing weaknesses. It assumes that many people can solve their own problems if they are given the opportunity - self-help through the dynamics of a mutual-support, self-education process. Alcoholics Anonymous is a classic example of such an approach.

Many criticisms have been levelled at the remedial approach. In particular, it has been charged that, because the remedial service model is almost inherently more dependency-producing than dependency-reducing, such services can very often do as much harm as they do good.

Preventive programs, while often useful in providing information that enables people to deal with some of their problems and to avoid others, have not been free of criticism either. In too many cases such programs have been no more than unrealistic middle-class lectures to the poor on how they should change their lifestyle - notwithstanding that these admonitions were not accompanied by the material resources required for such a change.

There is clearly room for a substantial injection of developmental approaches into both remedial and educational services. Self-help group processes, for example, are coming to play an increasing role in specialized treatment institutions and in multi-service agencies. They are also being increasingly used in community education programs. This recognition of the role of developmental approaches within traditional service-delivery mechanisms is of very recent vintage and much more remains to be done if the goal of encouraging individual social growth is to be incorporated throughout the social service system.

In addition to its effect on traditional services, the developmental approach has spawned its own set of services, directed at needs that were being missed by traditional service approaches. Many of the services now being provided to native people through Indian and Métis organizations, for example, are in this category. A wide range of self-help community service projects, initiated and carried out by dis-advantaged groups, also reflect this developmental approach.

The sorts of services provided in this developmental self-help fashion are generally "soft services", things like welfare information and advocacy offered to welfare recipients by welfare recipients. Public housing tenants acting as ombudsmen on behalf of other public housing tenants and assistance to deserted wives in obtaining do-it-yourself divorces by other deserted wives who had obtained their own divorces are further such examples. Very often the service is both developmental for the provider and remedial for the recipient - low-income homemakers helping disabled senior citizens in their homes, for example.

The recognition of these "soft services" as filling needs as real as those to which traditional "hard services" have been directed is a relatively new phenomenon. Only five years ago the idea of welfare recipients carrying out advocacy functions on behalf of other welfare recipients was regarded not as a service, but as meddlesome agitation or worse.

What makes these services developmental is their egalitarian and participatory character. The clearly defined roles which characterize the professional-client relationship are replaced by peer-support, with the recipient being encouraged to self-solve his problem. The broadening of the concept of social services to include such forms of peer-group support has represented a major step forward in making our social service system more adequate to the range of real social needs experienced in low-income communities.

Major credit for this breakthrough can be claimed by the Opportunities for Youth and Local Initiatives programs which provided financial support on a scale previously unknown. These were "the funds that launched a thousand services". But this credit must be shared with the thousands of members of low-income community groups who identified the unserviced needs of their communities and developed and implemented the programs directed at those needs.

Services, particularly services delivered in a participatory and developmental fashion, may contribute to self-development for their recipient; but their greater

contribution in this respect is very often to the person
providing the service. There is no question that among
the greatest successes of peer-group service projects have
been the self-discovery and growth experienced by many of
those employed by them. While, for the community, the
project was a service, for the person who carried it out
it was the opening of a long-locked door into him or her-
self. Two processes were taking place simultaneously in
such situations. One was the provision of a service; the
other was the creation of a growth opportunity for those
providing the service.

Traditionally, what have been called opportunity
programs have seen opportunities in a very narrow economic
frame; a successful opportunity program was one which
trained people for, and placed them in, jobs. It was in
this narrow tradition that, initially, creating jobs -
any job - was seen by government as the sole goal when
programs such as LIP and OFY were established. Creating
jobs and providing community services came to be the dual
goals of these programs only as they evolved. Jobs do
not exist in a vacuum; and because they must have context
and content, it quickly became apparent that the creation
of jobs could be combined with the advancement of a second
social goal, the provision of new community services. But,
as we have indicated, in many instances a third social
goal, of at least equal importance, was being attained -
individual social growth.

What was demonstrated by the most successful of these
LIP and OFY projects was not only the unmet service needs
of communities, but also the unmet social opportunity needs

of individuals. For many, whose life experiences had been
a sustained chronicle of social and economic marginality,
meeting the open-ended challenges presented by these projects
which they themselves ran became a voyage of self-discovery
and growth.

In 1973 the Department of Manpower commissioned a
study by researchers from the University of Calgary of a
representative sample of 145 of the more than 5,800 LIP
projects then being funded across Canada. 1,491 project
employees were interviewed in the course of the study;
72% reported that they had learned new skills in their
LIP jobs, 70% that they had an enhanced sense of personal
achievement, 68% reported an increased community awareness
and 65% said that they were now more confident of their
future. For these people the "job" had become a growth
experience which dramatically affected their self-concepts
and subsequent aspirations.

Creating jobs that become real growth experiences
should clearly be a central objective of the community
employment program. Creating services - or "need-meeting
situations" - in disadvantaged communities should also
clearly be a prime objective. There remains the question
of how these objectives can be pursued in the most effec-
tive and developmental fashion in the operation of this
program.

COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT AND COMMUNITY NEEDS

In our discussion of developmental social services
and growth-potential social opportunity situations, we
cited the important roles played by the Opportunities for
Youth and Local Initiatives programs. Both of these
federal government programs were similarly mandated to
create jobs by funding projects of community value.
Specifically, their respective mandates were, in the case
of OFY:

> To encourage and create student employment and
> activities which would be socially useful and
> personally satisfying and would reduce the
> predicted rate of student unemployment.

and in the case of LIP:

> ... the reduction of seasonal, regional and
> specific area unemployment and the provision
> of useful community services.

Apart from the fact of OFY's employment target group
being limited while that of LIP was not, the major difference
in these mandates is that the OFY criteria recognizes the
desirability that the jobs be "personally satisfying" as well
as being "socially useful", while LIP makes no reference to
their being more than "useful". This omission may represent
a very important difference in outlook on the part of those
who framed the respective programs but, notwithstanding this

omission, there seems in fact to have been an extremely high
level of job satisfaction among those employed on LIP projects.
The study conducted by the University of Calgary researchers
found more than 80% of those interviewed to be satisfied
with their jobs on nine of eleven criteria (the other two
being levels of pay and lack of security in the short-term
projects).

Where the difference in outlook between the two programs
becomes apparent is in their measurement of social usefulness
among competing projects. In 1973 the largest group of OFY
projects consisted of those categorized as recreation - over
30% of the accepted projects. In marked contrast, in its
first two years of operation (1971/72 and 1972/73) only 7.1%
of LIP projects were in the recreation category. The
largest LIP category was building construction (mostly
housing rehabilitation and repair) which represented 27.9%
of all projects.

Both LIP and OFY had comparable proportions of projects
in the social services field - 22.2% as compared with 24.8% -
and of education and information projects - 6.7% in OFY, 7.6%
in LIP. The proportion of cultural projects, however, was
over twice as great in OFY as in LIP - 13.5% as against 5.7%.

It is very difficult, of course, to draw a great many
conclusions from such broad characterizations. There is
also no basis for concluding that one or the other program
made a wiser assessment of comparative degrees of social
usefulness between competing types of projects. What these
figures clearly do illustrate, however, is that establishing
social usefulness, social need, community value or whatever

as the test is only a very partial answer to the question
of what sort of projects warrant support. There is still
the need to reconcile a broad spectrum of real and
legitimate social needs.

A further illustration of how varied assessments of
seemingly similar criteria can be in such a value-laden
field is offered by the New Horizons program. This program,
which also operates at the federal level, differs in one
important respect from OFY and LIP in that job creation
within its projects is not a part of its mandate. Its
function is to support project activity:

> ... which usefully and creatively involves
> retired people ... and which benefits them
> and their community.

Like OFY, New Horizons recognizes the importance of
the activity being of value for the doer as well as for
the community, but the essential common element again is
community value. Of the 1,068 projects funded by this
program between December 1972, when its first grants were
made, and August 1973, by far the largest group - 47% of
the total - were for "activity centers". These are focal
point facilities in which senior citizens can meet together,
establish informal relationships and develop whatever
programs of activities they wish. The second largest
category was recreation. Projects in this category, which
were mainly either sports and games or crafts and hobbies,
totalled a further 20%. Historical, cultural, educational
and informational projects represented 17% of the total,
while social services represented only 6%.

Again, we find the assessment of the relative priorities to be accorded various kinds of social needs to be dramatically different. Three programs, each addressing the same question, and three widely dissimilar results. It is important that this experience be kept in mind in assessing the prospective role of the community employment program.

It has been forecast for some time that the OFY and LIP programs would be merged and become an "opportunities for people" program. The community employment program would appear to be the program into which OFY and LIP are to be merged. Its intended role was described in the federal government's Working Paper on Social Security, as being the creation of "socially useful employment" and of "meeting social needs that are now neglected or inadequately met". It was not at all clear from what little was said in the Working Paper that what was being envisaged would warrant the broad and optimistic description of "opportunities for people".

In its commentary on the Working Paper, entitled Incomes and Opportunities and published in November 1973, the National Council of Welfare offered its views on various structural aspects of a community employment program. We argued that the meeting of social needs must be the paramount consideration in the program, and the creation of jobs must be seen in that context; otherwise the jobs could become mere make-work activities of no real value to those performing them or those for whom they are being performed. We further argued that the criteria for eligibility for participation in the program should be open and flexible, and that "within the framework

of broad guidelines ... community boards should be given
the authority to approve or reject projects in their area".

As our examination of the OFY, LIP and New Horizons
programs has indicated, the broad guidelines under which
project selections are made can have a very great effect
on the kind of community needs that come to be met.
Moreover, they influence the form which individual projects
are obliged, directly or indirectly, to take in seeking to
meet these needs. For example, if the guidelines embody a
strong service orientation, projects will reflect this in
their organization and in their operation. But not all
needs can be responded to by services.

The development of various kinds of storefront services
in low-income neighborhoods, for example, has been an
important innovation; but so might neighborhood drop-in
centers be. Such centers - similar in concept to the senior
citizens' activity centers - have a further counterpart in
the recently emergent women's centers, where ad hoc
discussion groups and task-oriented committees provide
opportunities for skills to be developed and self-awareness
to be increased in ways which no form of service could do.
Put another way, the service that such a center performs, it
performs simply by being. But this sort of "focal point
project", offering no structured service, would be unlikely
to win approval under any service-oriented guidelines.

The National Council of Welfare is aware that there
are a great many social needs that are not now being met,
and that a community employment program, of the scale we
foresee as necessary, can make a substantial beginning at

meeting a broad range of these needs. It will not do this, however, if its concept of needs is limited or if its view of means appropriate to meeting needs is narrow.

The provision of physical services, such as are involved in environmental rehabilitation, for example, represents an important need, and projects directed at such ends will no doubt be an element in the community employment program. Enabling the provision of social services that are now lacking is another important role for projects that the community employment program will no doubt support. If the LIP and OFY experiences are indicative, employment in such projects can be expected to provide not just jobs but real personal growth opportunities for some.

But the creation of social opportunity situations in disadvantaged communities by projects having this as their primary purpose, and not just as a fringe benefit accruing to some employees in projects directed at other ends, will require a broader definition of community need than will these service projects. Because projects directed at this goal will be even more amorphously defined than the softest of soft service projects, we fear that there will be a tendency to either reject them or to direct them into the more concrete form of a service orientation. Thus the neighborhood activity center referred to earlier, for example, would be forced to take the form of a neighborhood service center in order to win funding. It might still intend to play an informal focal point role as well as its service role, but people feel differently about service agencies, however indigenous, than they do about social centers. Inevitably a service center will find itself inescapably that, and neither more nor less than that.

Indeed, it has been observed that while the LIP program enabled many community groups to carry out service activities on a far more efficient basis than ever before, it was very often destructive of all the other functions of such groups. Innumerable instances have been cited of low-income organizations, which once had large and active memberships engaged in a variety of activities, having been transformed by LIP grants into service agencies in which active participation was limited to those employed in the service project.

There is no question of the value to low-income communities of a great many of these peer-group services; but it is important that the value of the non-service activities of these groups also be recognized. To do so requires an appreciation of the role these participation outlets play for those in the debilitating grip of poverty.

Poverty is deprivation and the cumulative effect of that deprivation is the deepening despair that entrapment in this life situation engenders. It is an insufficiency of income and opportunity to provide for the necessities of life - not just food and shelter, but the very real needs that go beyond these. It is hardly a novel commentary to assert that man cannot live by bread alone, that for a thinking, feeling being there must be more to life than mere physical subsistence. But for very many of the poor there is no more to life than that; nothing but a bare subsistence as each day passes indistinguishably into the next.

A 1970 cross-Canada study of 2,100 welfare recipients
conducted for the Federal-Provincial Study Group on Aliena-
tion, entitled the World of the Welfare Recipient, reported:

> The person on welfare tends to be a solitary
> rather than social creature ... not heavily
> involved in community activities. Only a
> quarter claim membership in a church, yet
> this is the highest level of affiliation
> they have with any group.

We have already observed some of the reasons why the
disadvantaged tend to be such solitary creatures, financially
and psychologically cut off from social, cultural and
recreational activity. Such non-participation has long been
recognized as an effect of poverty that itself becomes a
cause of subsequent social problems. Among the causal factors
cited by the American studies as accounting for the higher
prevalence of problem drinking among those at the bottom of
the socio-economic ladder, for example, were "a greater
level of alienation and anxiety" and "fewer options for
recreation and tension release".

The best way of avoiding the social costs of isolation
is clearly to enable the avoidance of that isolation. By
offering peer-group participation outlets, the non-service
functions of low-income community groups are directed at
needs as real as those of their services; and meeting those
needs often means that there will not be a later need of
services. A service-only orientation for the community
employment program will not only ignore the important reality
of these "participation needs", but indirectly discourage the
efforts that are now being made to meet them.

Again, the experience of LIP illustrates how the greater concreteness of services leads to their being heavily favored over projects designed to improve the quality of life in less visible fashions. Of the 3,024 projects in the Province of Ontario which applied for LIP funding in 1973-74, 22% were in the social services category while 20% were categorized as artistic, cultural or educational. Of the 822 of these projects that were granted funding, 32% were social services while only 14% were artistic, cultural or educational.

Arts and crafts and other such recreational pursuits may seem to fill no important social need, but the report to the Federal-Provincial Study Group found that among those welfare recipients who belonged to both a community organization and a recreational group, 87% had begun their participation with the recreational group. Without this outlet how many would have fallen into a deepening isolation with its attendant implications for their emotional well-being rather than gone on to an increased involvement in their community? Indeed, the recent conference of ministers responsible for recreation in the ten provinces declared physical, artistic, social and intellectual activities to be "a fundamental human need ... essential to the psychological, social and physical well-being".

We are not, in this discussion, arguing for any single set of priorities among social needs. Quite the contrary, what we are attempting to illustrate is just how broad the range of real and important social needs truly is. And what we propose is that this fact be recognized in the establishment of the guidelines under which the community employment program will operate.

DEVELOPING COMMUNITIES AND DEFINING THEIR NEEDS

Throughout the present discussion our focus has been on the meeting of individual social needs - that is, those needs which exist in the relationship of an individual to his or her community. We have argued the importance of these needs and the consequences of their being ignored. And we have indicated that the meeting of these individual needs lay in the facilitating of community processes - the mechanisms through which individual participation can take place.

Two years ago, in a statement entitled Guaranteed Incomes and Guaranteed Jobs, the National Council of Welfare observed that "communities define themselves". A geographic unit may or may not be a community. Certainly physical proximity can be an important determinant of whether or not community exists, but such proximity does not in itself make for community. Race or ethnicity can also be important determinants but, again, they do not alone ensure the existence of community.

Communities are groups of people who have something in common with one another, perceive the fact that they have that something in common, and regard that element of commonality as an important tieing bond. As we have observed, living in the same neighborhood can be that common element. So can working in the same plant or performing similar jobs in different work-places; and so can sharing a common language or culture. Indeed, there

is no common fact of life that will necessarily lead to the
development of a sense of community and virtually any common
circumstance potentially can - if it is perceived by those
who share it as forging such a bond.

It is an unfortunate, but undeniable, truth that few
of the communities of an earlier era exist today. The
urbanization process has substantially destroyed much of
what once was a strong sense of their immediate community
felt by many Canadians. This sense of community still
exists in many of our rural areas and can even be found in
some places within urban settings. But, by and large, the
rootless mobility brought about by the urbanization process
has resulted in the all-too-prevalent phenomenon of millions
of strangers living their aloneness in almost sardine-like
proximity to one another.

Labor unions, credit unions, occupational associations,
cultural organizations and a variety of other such groupings
which were spawned by a shared sense of community, where they
have survived and prospered, have largely done so by becoming
specialized and bureaucratized. In the pursuit of what came
to be narrowly defined objectives, they have become more like
service institutions and less like participatory communities.

But just as these historical processes must be
recognized, it is also evident that a counter-swing of
the pendulum has recently been taking place. New forms
of community organizations have begun to spring up in
myriad forms and reflecting a plethora of perceived
commonalities. Native people's organizations, welfare
recipients' organizations, public housing tenants'

organizations, low-income neighborhood groups, middle-income ratepayers' groups, pre-school parents' groups, single parents' groups, ex-inmates' groups - the list could go on and on almost without end.

Overwhelmingly these groups are small and tentative. That so many have had but the briefest of existences before fragmenting or simply falling into inactivity indicates that attempts to define community in terms that reflect today's elements of perceived commonality is a highly uncertain enterprise. But the enormous number of such attempts reflects the importance that is being attached to this objective.

In many instances government has sought to encourage and assist this process. The New Horizons program has tried to facilitate the development of community among groups of senior citizens. Various of the programs of the Citizenship Branch of the Secretary of State have tried to do the same for women, native people, ethnic groups and others. The Department of Indian Affairs has provided financial support to organizations of status Indians. And various federal and provincial departments have provided support to groups such as tenants, welfare recipients and a range of others.

From ethnic groups to environmental groups, the list of illustrations of government support for a multitude of perceived communities is long and varied. And while all of these efforts on the part of government are clearly commendable, their collective impact is uneven, inadequate and arbitrary. Taken together, they are a well-meaning but thoroughly incoherent hodge-podge.

Taking them together in this fashion is, of course, unfair to some of these programs where the eligible group is clearly defined, the grant criteria broad and flexible, and the available funding relatively adequate. With few exceptions, however, the tale of such programs has been one of scatter-gun availability of one-shot grants - discriminating between groups on no apparent basis, leaving groups in the lurch when they terminate, and reordering the priorities of groups to fit the conditions of program, funding criteria.

What is needed is a coherent program (or coherently integrated set of programs) directed at helping communities to define themselves and their needs and to establish the activities which meet those needs. And this requires sustained support throughout the several stages of a process of community evolution.

Facilitating the capacities of communities - and communities within communities - to define themselves through mechanisms which do not impose assumed definitions upon them is the first essential element for a program which aspires ultimately to meet community needs. Communities must first be enabled to define themselves; only then will they be able to begin defining their collective needs.

The existence of community is not only an essential pre-condition to the definition of community need, but itself represents an important social need. The need of separated mothers to establish relationships with others who share their situation and of native people to become

involved in activities with other native people are examples
of individuals seeking community that were cited earlier in
our discussion. The roles of senior citizens' activity
centers and women's centers were referred to as illustrations
of focal point facilities around which communities can
coalesce and begin to evolve a collective self-definition.
Ethnic centers and native friendship centers are other such
examples.

But this is still only the beginning of an ongoing
process. Once a group has achieved a level of collective
self-definition such that it sees itself as a community, an
initial set of needs has already been met. Those who engaged
themselves in this process did so in reflection of their
perceived need of creating a community of which they could
feel a part. Through the developmental nature of participa-
tion in this process, that need will have been met when that
sense of community has come to exist.

When, through whatever community mechanisms have been
created in the earlier process, the community has collectively
identified its immediate needs and designed and implemented
the projects which it sees as meeting those needs, it will
again have been changed. Both those who participated in
these processes and those who participate only in the utiliza-
tion of the community resource thus brought into being will,
to differing degrees, have had their needs affected by it.
Individually and collectively, the community will not be
the same at the end of this process as it was at the beginning.
Old needs will have been satisfied and disappeared and new
needs will have taken their place.

Because of the developmental dynamic of the process, the programs created and the organizational forms evolved by it may have ceased to reflect community needs by the time they are fully in place. This does not mean that the process has been misdirected. On the contrary, this may represent its consumate triumph. Static programs and static forms can remain relevant only for a static community. If forms and processes are truly developmental they will effect change in all who participate in them.

Moreover, the very definition of the community cannot be expected to remain static. Welfare recipients sharing a set of common objections to the welfare system will likely lose their sense of community when the welfare system has been changed and those objectionable features have disappeared, in the same way that it was the successes of labor unions that led to the breakdown in community among unionists. Again, this does not suggest that these transitional communities were unreal. They were very real - for as long as they were perceived as being so by their members. In fact, this phenomenon of transitional communities can probably be expected to be far more the rule than the exception in any anticipation of communities of the future.

The stage-by-stage process by which community is formed and re-formed, its needs defined, met and redefined cannot be ignored by any program that is seriously committed to meeting community social needs. It is thus very relevant for the community employment program. The danger is that this program may be so concerned with instant job creation that it will be unwilling to invest the necessary funds or

patience in this developmental process. If this is the case, then a great measure of the potential of this program will be lost.

The Local Employment Assistance Program (LEAP), which has emerged from the LIP experience on a small-scale experimental basis, has much about it that is far too narrow to serve as an appropriate model for the community employment program (in particular, the requirement that projects either become self-sustaining or self-liquidating by placing their employees in other employment by the end of the grant period). But it also has some features which warrant being incorporated in the new program.

Of the 126 projects presently being funded by LEAP, 26 grew out of LIP projects. Of the remainder, a further 26 began not on an "instant project" basis, but with developmental grants providing up to six months of financial support for the process by which the participating community defined the needs to which the project was to be directed and designed the project to meet these needs. Since the period of LIP funding represented a developmental stage for another 26 projects, almost half the LEAP projects are thus the product of developmental stage funding prior to operational stage funding. A similar willingness to invest in each of the several stages of an evolving community process is essential if the community employment program is to achieve more than limited goals.

Government programs have always tended to be narrowly compartmentalized. Programs to encourage community development and programs to create jobs or establish services have

been so far removed from one another that it has seemed
always the proverbial case of the right hand not knowing
what the left hand is doing. Lessons learned in the
experience of one program have seldom been passed on to
the next - particularly when these were programs of
different departments.

The community employment program, as we have stressed
throughout this report, can simultaneously pursue a number
of fully compatible goals - if its federal-provincial
designers do not build it in their classic strait-jacket
mold. It can draw together the best of the many disconnected
threads that are now embodied in various of the programs
that have been referred to in this report and build on these
experiences. What is needed is a comprehensive approach to
the meeting of social needs and creation of social opportu-
nities, not another patch on the present patch-work quilt
of job creation, service provision and community development
programs.

CONCLUSION

This report began with the observation that what it was about, the social opportunity situations that enable individuals to expand and grow and develop their potentials as people, encompasses the totality of life. In the course of the report we have talked of social services, of employment, of non-work activity and of community. But we have talked of all of these in terms of a single perspective - human needs. We have said that these are myriad and ever-changing but that underlying them always is the need to have new needs - the need to grow. And we have argued for a developmental approach to meeting needs for precisely this reason.

In our discussion of the role that these developmental approaches can play in the social services field we have stressed that the involvement of consumers in the definition of their service needs will not only lead to more relevant and effective services, but that this involvement itself fulfils a need-meeting function. Isolation is an effect of poverty that becomes a cause of subsequent social problems; participation in community activities (including service activities, but also cultural, recreational and other activities) can result in the avoidance of these problems.

In talking of participation we have examined the phenomenon of community and the many forms that it can take. We have called for a recognition that community is not something that can be established by fiat or arbitrarily imposed, that it will define itself in terms that are meaningful to

its members at a given time, and that this process of
community definition warrants encouragement and support.
Negative communities - communities of protest - may spring
up spontaneously and without need of encouragement; positive
communities are likely to emerge only in response to the
opportunity of a positive role to play.

We believe our view of the need in men and women to
strive for self-esteem and self-fulfilment is an accurate
one, and that its recognition can carry policy makers far
beyond the present sterile debates about whether or not
so-called "work ethics" are alive or dead. And we believe
it essential that this perception of human need be
incorporated in the forthcoming community employment program
because of the unique opportunity that program offers to
make a beginning in the many areas in which our society
presently fails so many of its members.

We are under no illusions that this one program can
do more than make a beginning. But if it is based on a
firm commitment to individual growth through the fostering
of community processes, it can be an important beginning.
None of what we have called for in this program is in itself
novel; throughout our discussion we have identified the roots
of our various proposals in a range of existing programs.
The novelty we propose is to incorporate the best features
of each in the design of this new program.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare spoke
recently about the New Horizons program in terms which we
think aptly convey all we have put forward with respect to
the community employment program. Several paragraphs from

the Minister's speech are set out below with only a slight
change made in his text: where he referred to "the aged"
or "senior citizens" we have broadened the application of
his remarks by adding in parenthesis "the disadvantaged";
where he referred to the New Horizons program we have
added "(the community employment program)".

> Our society has sometimes tended to take a rather
> paternalistic attitude in the establishment of
> programs for the aged (the disadvantaged). It
> has tended to prescribe, rather than to ask
> before acting. But one of the basic premises
> of New Horizons (the community employment program)
> is self-determination. It is already evident
> from our limited experience with the program
> that there is, as a good many of us suspected
> or knew, a great fund of creativity and drive
> among older people (the disadvantaged). By
> identifying their own needs, by creating their
> own projects, by working through their own
> problems and requesting assistance as they need
> it, our senior citizens (the disadvantaged) are
> in a position to demonstrate hitherto unrecog-
> nized capacities. And in doing so, they are able
> to contribute to significant changes in attitude
> on the part of other members of the population.
>
> Further, retired people (the disadvantaged) can
> be expected to begin, through this program, to
> identify those problems which have proved to be
> barriers to their full participation in Canadian
> society. As these barriers are identified,
> strategies to deal with them can be developed by
> senior citizens (the disadvantaged) themselves,
> by institutions in society which work with
> retired people (the disadvantaged), by various
> levels of government, and by joint action by all
> of these elements of society.

We agree fully with the Minister's views concerning the
aged - and contend that they apply equally to all other disad-

vantaged groups as well. The community employment program
affords the chance to offer new horizons to all of Canada's
disadvantaged. To seize that chance is to invest in the
development of Canada's vast store of untapped human
resources - to opt to stop wasting people. To do less is
to ignore the potential that lies in this program.